## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

# IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

# SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

#### **DIVISION TWO**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LIGGINS WALDROP,

Defendant and Appellant.

B212921

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. NA077236)

### THE COURT:\*

Liggins Waldrop (appellant) appeals following his plea of "no contest" to one count of leaving the scene of a vehicular accident resulting in serious injury to another person, a violation of Vehicle Code section 20001, subdivision (a). The trial court sentenced appellant to the low term of two years, doubled because of his prior strike conviction, for a total prison term of four years. (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(i); 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d).)

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an "opening brief" containing an acknowledgement that she had been unable to find any arguable issues. On July 29, 2009, we advised appellant that he

<sup>\*</sup> BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., ASHMANN-GERST, J.

had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

Since appellant entered a plea before trial, we glean the facts from the transcript of appellant's preliminary hearing on March 17, 2008. Luis Rincon (Rincon) testified that shortly before midnight on November 13, 2007, he and Arnulfo Leon (Leon) were in Leon's Silverado truck on the freeway. Rincon was driving. Rincon experienced car trouble, pulled onto the right shoulder, and put on the hazard lights. As Rincon inspected the truck's battery, he felt the truck being blown on top of him. He then found himself completely covered by the truck. Rincon could not extricate himself, and Leon was unable to pull Rincon out. Rincon heard a third person ask Leon if Rincon was okay. Leon replied that he was not and that Rincon was under the truck. The other person said he had to leave. He gave no personal information. Rincon was eventually taken to the hospital where he spent one month. He had very serious injuries and underwent surgery.

Officer Jonathan Peck of the California Highway Patrol responded to the scene and found two vehicles that appeared to have been in a collision in the right shoulder of the highway. It appeared that a green Chevrolet Camaro had run into a truck. Leon told Officer Peck that he was sitting in the truck when he felt an impact. He looked back and saw that the green Camaro had hit the truck. Officer Peck determined that the driver of the Camaro had violated Vehicle Code section 22107 by making an unsafe turn from the roadway and being involved in a collision.

Officer Peck eventually spoke with appellant in the hospital. Appellant said he was exiting the freeway when he saw a truck in the exit lane. At first he believed it was stopped, and then he believed it started backing up towards him. Then he struck it. Appellant told Officer Peck he was injured and went to get help. A passerby called an ambulance for him. Officer Peck determined the collision was not at the freeway exit.

Appellant was remanded. On July 18, 2008, defense counsel declared a doubt as to appellant's competency, and two doctors were appointed to interview appellant. On September 4, 2008, based on the medical reports, the trial court found appellant mentally

competent to stand trial. On October 30, 2008, appellant's *Marsden*<sup>1</sup> motion was heard and denied. Appellant then changed his plea to "no contest" and accepted the sentence offered to him by the trial court.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

<sup>1</sup> People v. Marsden (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118 (Marsden).